

Response After Final
Serial No. 09/941,700
Attorney Docket No. 011076

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. No amendment has been proposed. It is respectfully submitted that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated October 19, 2005.

As to the Merits:

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner maintains the following rejections:

- 1) claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC '102(b) as being anticipated by Hotta (U.S. Patent No. 4,686,673);
- 2) claims 2, 8, 9, 12, 18, 19, 22, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC '103(a) as being unpatentable Hotta in view of Takehisa;
- 3) claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14, 16, 23, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC '103(a) as being unpatentable Hotta in view of Profumo;
- 4) claims 5, 15 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC '103(a) as being unpatentable Hotta in view of Profumo in further view of Persson; and

Response After Final
Serial No. 09/941,700
Attorney Docket No. 011076

5) claims 10, 20 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC '103(a) as being unpatentable
Hotta in view of Kobayashi.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

Although, Applicants' argued in the previous response filed August 11, 2005 that Hotta fails to disclose the transmission timing control unit controlling the timings of signal transmission for respective ones of said plurality of mobile terminal devices having path division multiple connection to a specific time slot, to allow said plurality of mobile terminal devices to have their respective synchronization windows spaced from each other, as appropriate, within said specific time slot, the Examiner appears to take the position in the outstanding second office action that such transmission timing control is also carried out in Hotta.

However, it is submitted that the Examiner has overlooked the important fact that the present invention relates to suppression of degradation of speech characteristics of mobile terminal devices of multiple users having path division multiple connection to a single time slot, and interference between such users. The Examiner merely refers to timing control for both the synchronization windows and the data windows contained in the TDMA frame in Hotta, and his argument is not based on the mobile terminal devices of the present invention for multiple users having path division multiple connections to the same time

Response After Final
Serial No. 09/941,700
Attorney Docket No. 011076

slot.

More specifically, with regard to Applicants' argument that Hotta is not concerned at all with respective synchronization windows of user mobile terminals being spaced from each other within a specific time slot, since Hotta is only concerned with controlling the position of a single sync window, the Examiner asserts that:

the transmission timing control unit is discussed in further detail in Hotta, column 3, line 65-column 4, line 2, and figure 2. There must be transmission timing control for both the synch windows and the data windows contained in the TDMA frame, so as to keep them from overlapping and being incorrectly received. They are spaced out from one another. The language of the independent claims reads on the disclosure of Hotta.

However, based on the above, it is submitted that the Examiner has either not appreciate that the present invention allows for a plurality of mobile terminal devices to have their respective synchronization windows spaced from each other within a specific time slot or that the Examiner is mis-characterizing the teachings of Hotta. That is, according to col. 3, lines 42-44 and col. 3, line 64-col. 4, line 2 of Hotta:

It is now assumed that the earth station 6-1 in the spot area A is a predetermined reference station of the SDMA/SS-TDMA system.

The example of the TDMA frame shown in Fig. 2 is constituted by a sync window 105 forming a time slot adapted to synchronize the communication satellite and the reference station, and data windows 106, 107, 108 and 109 forming time slots for interconnection between predetermined ones of the earth stations 6-1 to 6-4.

In other words, in Hotta, since the communication satellite (Fig. 1) is only synchronized with the single predetermined earth reference station (i.e., earth-station 6-1), the statellite is able

Response After Final
Serial No. 09/941,700
Attorney Docket No. 011076

to synchronized to the predetermined reference station by using a single sync window 105 in Fig. 2, see also Figs. 5b, 6a and 8a of Hotta.

Therefore, it is submitted that Hotta fails to disclose or fairly suggest the features of the present claimed invention concerning *a transmission timing control unit controlling timings of signal transmission for respective ones of said plurality of mobile terminal devices having path division multiple connection to a specific time slot, to allow said plurality of mobile terminal devices to have their respective synchronization windows spaced from each other, as appropriate, within said specific time slot.*

In view of the aforementioned remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,450
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/jl